

## Article

# Moral and mental health challenges faced by maternity staff during the COVID-19 pandemic

Horsch, Antje, Lalor, Joan and Downe, Soo

Available at <https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/33621/>

*Horsch, Antje, Lalor, Joan and Downe, Soo orcid iconORCID: 0000-0003-2848-2550 (2020) Moral and mental health challenges faced by maternity staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy . ISSN 1942-9681*

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000629>

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to  
<http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/> and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to  
<http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [policies](#) page.

# Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy

## Moral and Mental Health Challenges Faced by Maternity Staff During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Antje Horsch, Joan Lalor, and Soo Downe

Online First Publication, June 1, 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000629>

### CITATION

Horsch, A., Lalor, J., & Downe, S. (2020, June 1). Moral and Mental Health Challenges Faced by Maternity Staff During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000629>

# Moral and Mental Health Challenges Faced by Maternity Staff During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Antje Horsch

University of Lausanne and Lausanne University Hospital

Joan Lalor

Trinity College Dublin

Soo Downe

University of Central Lancashire

The current COVID-19 pandemic places maternity staff at risk of engaging in clinical practice that may be in direct contravention with evidence; professional recommendations; or, more profoundly, deeply held ethical or moral beliefs and values, as services attempt to control the risk of cross-infection. Practice changes in some settings include reduction in personal contacts for tests, treatments and antenatal and postnatal care, exclusion of birth partners for labor and birth, separation of mother and baby in the immediate postnatal period, restrictions on breastfeeding, and reduced capacity for hands-on professional labor support through social distancing and use of personal protective equipment. These enforced changes may result in increasing levels of occupational moral injury that need to be addressed at both an organizational and a personal level.

**Keywords:** COVID-19, health care professionals, moral injury, mental health, maternity care

The current coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak represents an important threat to public health but also unique challenges to health care workers, for many reasons. The best way of treating the infection is yet unknown, and health care workers fear for their own safety, the safety of their patients, and that of their loved ones (Maunder, 2009). They are required to adapt their practices, often without much time for reflection or evidence gathering. Research on previous epidemics and pandemics has shown the toll that caring for patients can have on the mental health of staff, such as elevated levels of psychological distress; insomnia; alcohol and drug misuse; and symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, burnout, anger, and higher perceived stress (Vyas, Delaney, Webb-Murphy, & Johnston, 2016). These mental health problems may negatively impact the way in which professionals interact with their patients, including avoidance of infected patients (Fiksenbaum, Marjanovic, Greenglass, & Coffey, 2006; Marjanovic, Greenglass, & Coffey, 2007).

Although the evidence clearly shows a negative impact on the mental health of health care workers in general, no specific data

regarding its impact on staff caring for childbearing women and their families exist. This group is particularly relevant, because pregnant women are usually healthy, and medical interventions are usually kept to a minimum in maternity care. Face-to-face psychological support is as important as physical checks, and good quality maternity care requires a trusting relationship between professionals and families. Good eye contact, touch, and tone are critical elements of care, particularly during labor. During a pandemic, the restriction of face-to-face antenatal and postnatal care, the need for personal protective equipment (PPE) that limits personal engagement, and the restriction on supportive touch may be as distressing for staff to carry out as it is for women and families to experience.



In the United Kingdom, there has been a mixed organizational response to COVID-19 in maternity services. Some hospitals have closed community services and moved all care to centralized hospitals. In Ireland, almost all maternity care services are centralized within hospital networks, so closure of community provision is not an issue. However, face-to-face contacts have been reduced, because a significant proportion of antenatal care is now managed through virtual consultations and antenatal education's being delivered online. Across both countries, limits have been placed on the number of tests and treatments available in some settings, in both ante- and postnatal care, and birth companionship and postnatal visiting have been restricted.

As part of a COST Action CA 18211 network funded by the European Union (EU), the authors set up a website (European Cooperation in Science and Technology, 2020) in response to calls from midwives and obstetricians on the frontline to have a one-stop shop to access central resources and to capture how maternity care is being affected by the current COVID-19 crisis. Examples submitted to the website by maternity workers include a forced separation of mothers and babies for up to 14 days if mothers are confirmed or suspected of being COVID-19-positive, a lack of opportunity to support mothers with breastfeeding, and the prohi-

---

**Editor's Note.** This commentary received rapid review due to the time-sensitive nature of the content. It was reviewed by the journal editor.—KKT

---

 Antje Horsch, Institute of Higher Education and Research in Healthcare, University of Lausanne, and Department Woman-Mother-Child, Lausanne University Hospital; Joan Lalor, Research School of Nursing and Midwifery, Trinity College Dublin;  Soo Downe, Faculty of Health, University of Central Lancashire.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Antje Horsch, Institute of Higher Education and Research in Healthcare, University of Lausanne, Route de la Corniche 10, 1010 Lausanne, Switzerland. E-mail: antje.horsch@chuv.ch

bition on the admission of birth partners during labor or during the postpartum hospital stay. Even more traumatic stories are emerging from some countries, where women have been told they must have their labor induced or have a caesarean section against their will, in contradiction to their human rights concerning consent to such interventions (Birthrights, 2020). Some women have to do this without companionship where few staff are available and in hospitals full of patients with severe COVID-19 symptoms, which causes them to worry that they and/or their baby may become infected. All of these practices are potentially both physically and psychologically damaging for mothers and babies. All are in direct contravention of COVID-19 recommendations from relevant organizations, such as the World Health Organization (<https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/emergencies/COVID-19-pregnancy-ipc-breastfeeding-infographics/en/>), International Confederation of Midwives ([https://www.internationalmidwives.org/icm-news/unfpa-statement-on-novel-coronavirus-\(covid-19\)-and-pregnancy.html](https://www.internationalmidwives.org/icm-news/unfpa-statement-on-novel-coronavirus-(covid-19)-and-pregnancy.html)), and International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (<https://www.figo.org/safe-motherhood-and-covid-19>).

When local organizational imperatives and clinical practice are in direct contravention with evidence; professional recommendations; or, more profoundly, deeply held ethical or moral beliefs and values, this can give rise to increasing levels of occupational moral injury (Litz et al., 2009). In extreme cases, staff can feel that they have become the instruments of inhumane treatment of women and babies—the active perpetrators of psychological and physical harm, in complete violation of their moral norms and practice standards. Central to the concerns of many maternity workers is the disruption of their relationship with the women caused by the introduction of pandemic-related measures. This is exacerbated by the fact that, in parallel with a sense of moral injury, for many staff, there may also be a sense of relief that they are protected from infection by the use of PPE and other security measures that have been imposed. Because of the unprecedented and relentless work pressure, even a strong sense of ethical and moral duty can, understandably, be dulled, leading to emotional distancing for self-preservation. However, later reflection on the attitudes and behaviors that result from such necessary disciplining may retraumatize health care providers and make them more vulnerable to developing mental health problems, such as PTSD, depression, and suicidal ideation (Williamson, Stevelink, & Greenberg, 2018). In turn, this may lead to reduced working hours and increased turnover (Mauder et al., 2006).

Several approaches may help maternity staff to counteract the negative effects of the current pandemic on their morale and mental health. Managers should ensure that time and space is given to help staff reflect on and make sense of the morally difficult decisions they must take. One such approach may be Schwartz rounds (Flanagan, Chadwick, Goodrich, Ford, & Wickens, 2020) organized by team leaders, which could also be carried out in a virtual format. Schwartz rounds follow a structured format that allows health care professionals to discuss and reflect on the emotional work-related challenges of their day-to-day practice, in a safe and confidential space (Flanagan et al., 2020). In addition, a peer support program that is available to all staff, including a discussion about moral injury and early warning signs to look out for, could be offered (Greenberg, Docherty, Gnanapragasam, & Wessely, 2020). Staff reporting high and persistent levels of psychological distress or mental health problems should be identified early and offered appropriate specialist support.

In conclusion, the unique challenges that the current COVID-19 pandemic poses place maternity staff at risk of engaging in changed practices that may be in direct contravention with evidence; professional recommendations; or, more profoundly, deeply held ethical or moral beliefs and values. This may result in increasing levels of occupational moral injury that need to be addressed, both at an organizational and at a personal level. Health services should begin offering psychosocial support for staff to protect their mental well-being if they are to continue to provide high-quality care.

## References

- Birthrights. (2020). *Human rights charity calls for protection of U.K. women in childbirth during national emergency*. Retrieved from <https://www.birthrights.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Final-Covid-19-Birthrights-31.3.20.pdf>
- European Cooperation in Science and Technology. (2020). *Maternity care during COVID19: EU COST Action CA18211*. Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/view/covid19maternitycostactionca18/home>
- Fiksenbaum, L., Marjanovic, Z., Greenglass, E. R., & Coffey, S. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and state anger in nurses who worked during the SARS outbreak: The role of perceived threat and organizational support. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 25*, 89–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7870/cjcmh-2006-0015>
- Flanagan, E., Chadwick, R., Goodrich, J., Ford, C., & Wickens, R. (2020). Reflection for all healthcare staff: A national evaluation of Schwartz rounds. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 34*, 140–142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2019.1636008>
- Greenberg, N., Docherty, M., Gnanapragasam, S., & Wessely, S. (2020). Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ, 368*, m1211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1211>
- Litz, B. T., Stein, N., Delaney, E., Lebowitz, L., Nash, W. P., Silva, C., & Maguen, S. (2009). Moral injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy. *Clinical Psychology Review, 29*, 695–706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.07.003>
- Marjanovic, Z., Greenglass, E. R., & Coffey, S. (2007). The relevance of psychosocial variables and working conditions in predicting nurses' coping strategies during the SARS crisis: An online questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 44*, 991–998. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.012>
- Mauder, R. G. (2009). Was SARS a mental health catastrophe? *General Hospital Psychiatry, 31*, 316–317. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2009.04.004>
- Mauder, R. G., Lancee, W. J., Balderson, K. E., Bennett, J. P., Borgundvaag, B., Evans, S., . . . Wasylenki, D. A. (2006). Long-term psychological and occupational effects of providing hospital healthcare during SARS outbreak. *Emerging Infectious Diseases, 12*, 1924–1932. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1212.060584>
- Vyas, K. J., Delaney, E. M., Webb-Murphy, J. A., & Johnston, S. L. (2016). Psychological impact of deploying in support of the U.S. response to Ebola: A systematic review and meta-analysis of past outbreaks. *Military Medicine, 181*, e1515–e1531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7205/MILMED-D-15-00473>
- Williamson, V., Stevelink, S. A., & Greenberg, N. (2018). Occupational moral injury and mental health: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 212*, 339–346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.55>

Received April 14, 2020

Revision received April 30, 2020

Accepted May 6, 2020 ■